



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,238	04/16/2004	Alison B. Lukacsko		9635

ALISON B. LUKACSKO⁷⁵⁹⁰ 12/02/2008
11 BROOKFIELD WAY
WEST WINDSOR, NJ 08550

EXAMINER

JAGOE, DONNA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/02/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,238

Applicant(s)

LUKACSKO, ALISON B.

Examiner

Donna Jagoe

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-49 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments filed July 1, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-49 are pending. Claims 1-44 are withdrawn, Claims 45-49 are rejected.

Manner of amending claims

The amendment to the claims filed on July 1, 2008 does not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(c) because claims 1-44 are missing. There is not a complete listing of the claims.

Amendments to the claims filed on or after July 30, 2003 must comply with 37 CFR 1.121(c) which states:

(c) Claims . Amendments to a claim must be made by rewriting the entire claim with all changes (e.g., additions and deletions) as indicated in this subsection, except when the claim is being canceled. Each amendment document that includes a change to an existing claim, cancellation of an existing claim or addition of a new claim, must include a complete listing of all claims ever presented, including the text of all pending and withdrawn claims, in the application. The claim listing, including the text of the claims, in

the amendment document will serve to replace all prior versions of the claims, in the application. In the claim listing, the status of every claim must be indicated after its claim number by using one of the following identifiers in a parenthetical expression: (Original), (Currently amended), (Canceled), (Withdrawn), (Previously presented), (New), and (Not entered)

(1) Claim listing. All of the claims presented in a claim listing shall be presented in ascending numerical order. Consecutive claims having the same status of "canceled " or "not entered " may be aggregated into one statement (e.g., Claims 1 –5 (canceled)). The claim listing shall commence on a separate sheet of the amendment document and the sheet(s) that contain the text of any part of the claims shall not contain any other part of the amendment.

(2) When claim text with markings is required. All claims being currently amended in an amendment paper shall be presented in the claim listing, indicate a status of "currently amended, " and be submitted with markings to indicate the changes that have been made relative to the immediate prior version of the claims. The text of any added subject matter must be shown by underlining the added text. The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters. The text of any deleted subject matter must be shown by being placed within double brackets if strike-through cannot be easily perceived. Only claims having the

status of "currently amended," or "withdrawn" if also being amended, shall include markings. If a withdrawn claim is currently amended, its status in the claim listing may be identified as "withdrawn — currently amended."

(3) When claim text in clean version is required. The text of all pending claims not being currently amended shall be presented in the claim listing in clean version, i.e., without any markings in the presentation of text. The presentation of a clean version of any claim having the status of "original," "withdrawn" or "previously presented" will constitute an assertion that it has not been changed relative to the immediate prior version, except to omit markings that may have been present in the immediate prior version of the claims of the status of "withdrawn" or "previously presented." Any claim added by amendment must be indicated with the status of "new" and presented in clean version, i.e., without any underlining.

(4) When claim text shall not be presented; canceling a claim.

(i) No claim text shall be presented for any claim in the claim listing with the status of "canceled" or "not entered."

(ii) Cancellation of a claim shall be effected by an instruction to cancel a particular claim number. Identifying the status of a claim in the claim listing as "canceled" will constitute an instruction to cancel the claim.

(5) Reinstatement of previously canceled claim. A claim which was previously canceled may be reinstated only by adding the claim as a "new" claim with a new claim number.

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, "a method for directly killing microorganisms" (present claim 45) is a concept that was not present in the specification as originally filed.

The specification as originally filed contains the following disclosures concerning the word "directly":

(i) "The AQAC (sic) will directly impact those microbes, including the corynebacterium (sic) and diphtheroids and that benefit will be further enhanced by the dryness that is hostile to the organisms" (page 26, paragraph 87);

The above disclosure, however, do not provide adequate support for the "ACQA" to "directly kill microorganisms".

Written Description

An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams and formula that fully set forth the claimed invention.

Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

The Examiner is guided in his opinion that Applicant has not adequately described the presently claimed subject matter by the MPEP at § 2163 - 2163.05. In particular, while Applicant's specification as originally filed contained a generic disclosure of the ACQA-antiperspirant combination being beneficial in bromhidrosis and the AQAC (sic) directly impacting microbes; such does not entitle Applicants to now claim "directly killing microorganisms" because this was not previously set forth or that would have been immediately envisaged by one skilled in the art from the specification as originally filed. "A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996)"(emphasis added), see MPEP § 2163(I)(A).

Considering the teachings provided in the specification as originally filed, the Examiner finds that Applicants have failed to provide the necessary teachings, by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams and formula that fully set for the claimed invention, in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that Applicants had possession of the concept of directly killing microorganisms.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wassenaar U.S. Patent No. 7,060,289 B2 in view of Merck Manual (U).

Wassenaar teaches the method of reducing excessive sweating and minimizing side effects (see abstract) comprising applicant of a topical formulation of glycopyrrolate (an anticholinergic quaternary amine) in a concentration that is from 0.25% to 6% (column 8, lines 29-30). It does not teach the method for killing or inhibiting the growth of microorganisms responsible for fungal infection and non-pathological body malodor. Wassenaar teaches a case study of a patient with excessive sweating of the forehead and groin that resulted in a facial rash and fungal infection. After two weeks the chronic fungal infection of his groin and facial rash had both improved (column 8, lines 32-49).

Merck Manual teaches that athlete's foot, a fungal infection commonly grows in the warm moist areas between the toes.

In holding an invention obvious in view of a combination of references, there must be some suggestion, motivation or teaching in the prior art that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to select the references and combine them in the way that would produce the claimed invention. This motivation may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved. Here, filtered through the nature of the problem to be solved, the prior art disclosed that moist conditions of the skin leads

to fungal infection, and that this problem can be addressed by the application of glycopyrrolate solution in a concentration of 0.25-6%. Thus, inhibition of microorganisms and fungus would result in the application of the glycopyrrolate solution, and in the above case study, a fungus infection could be resolved.

Regarding the concentration of the formulation instantly claimed, one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare additional useful compositions of the ranges taught by the prior art. While the reference is silent regarding some % ratios, the difference in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. When the general conditions are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 45, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In the absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results of the additional ranges claimed, the instant invention is considered obvious. "[A] prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness." *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 2003). See also *In re Harris*, 409 F.3d 1339, 74 USPQ2d 1951 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to employ the ACQA, glycopyrrolate, to inhibit growth of microorganisms responsible for fungal infection and malodor motivated by the teaching of Wassenaar, who teaches the method of reducing excessive sweating and minimizing side effects (see abstract) comprising applicant of a topical formulation of glycopyrrolate (an

anticholinergic quaternary amine) in a concentration that is from 0.25% to 6% (column 8, lines 29-30) and the teaching of Merck Manual that teaches that athlete's foot fungus is a fungal infection that commonly grows in warm moist areas.

Response to Arguments

Regarding the amendment drawn to "directly killing microorganisms and inhibiting the growth of microorganisms responsible for fungal infection and non-pathological body malodor with the anticholinergic quaternary amine compound; glycopyrrolate, In response, "Products of identical chemical composition (i.e. glycopyrrolate) can not have mutually exclusive properties." A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims (i.e. relief of inhibition and killing of microorganisms responsible for non-pathologic body malodor) are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (Applicant argued that the claimed composition was a pressure sensitive adhesive containing a tacky polymer while the product of the reference was hard and abrasion resistant. "The Board correctly found that the virtual identity of monomers and procedures sufficed to support a prima facie case of unpatentability of Spada's polymer latexes for lack of novelty."). Further, in the case study, the 35 year old patient with chronic fungal infections of the groin experienced improvement. Although it does not teach "directly killing microorganisms and inhibiting the growth of microorganisms responsible for fungal infection and non-pathological body malodor" the patient's fungal

infection improved with the use of glycopyrrolate solution. Applicant asserts that the experiment by Wassenaar shows that reducing the availability of moisture (sweat) can lead to improvement in a fungal infection. In response, anyone with ordinary skill in the art would not conclude that reduced sweating would improve a fungal infection. It takes an antifungal medication to improve a fungal infection. Wassenaar demonstrated an antifungal property of glycopyrrolate in the improvement of the fungal rash in the 35 year old patient.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Trichophyton in vitro experiments) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 1614

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Donna Jagoe /D. J./
Examiner
Art Unit 1614

November 20, 2008

/Ardin Marschel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614